UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,352	12/11/2003	Jukka Salonen	0365-0638PUS1	3575
	7590 12/08/200 ART KOLASCH & BI	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 22040 0747	SALIARD, SHANNON S		
FALLS CHUR	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		3628		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/08/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/734,352	SALONEN, JUKKA		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	SHANN	ION S. SALIARD	3628					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on t	he cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 10 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or application, applicant must timely file one of the followi application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of A for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 3 periods:	ring replies: (Appeal (with	1) an amendment, affidavi appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
 a)								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706. Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dhave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704.	5.07(f). date on which of extension ar the shortened later than three	the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ad the corresponding amount of statutory period for reply origi	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	¬(b).							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on 25 November 2009. the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reAMENDMENTS 	a)), or any ex	tension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the				
3. 🔲 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection	on, but prior	to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further				04400				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE b		•	,,					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or	better form	for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling	g a correspo	nding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a	(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR		attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	· · ——	- I W II						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).		•	•	-				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is particle. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>19 and 21-23</u> .			l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of fil entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess	to overcome	all rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ation of the s	status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet.	d but does N	OT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (statement).	(s). (PTO/SB	/08) Paper No(s)						
		/Shannon S Saliard/						
		Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3628					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues, "Nowhere in Kupsch is there any disclosure or suggestion of assigning/selecting a reply address from a group of available predefined replay [sic] messages as claimed." First the Examiner notes that the rejection is based on the combined teachings of Tarnanen, Kagi and Kupsch. Tarnanen discloses "assigning a unique reply address to an SMS message from a multiplity of available reply addresses (col 2, lines 3-37 and col 7,lines 21-41). Kupsch et al was only used to show that it is old and well known in the art at the time of the invention to predefine unique SMS reply addresses. Specifically, Kupsch discloses, "At step 230, the sent message arrives at Internet Gateway 20. Internet Gateway 20 assigns a unique tracking identification number to the message and associates the unique identification number with the user who sent the message. The identification number may be of any form or combination of numbers and/or letters." (col 5, lines 5-17), Kupsch further discloses that originating address will be used as the destination address by the recipient when replying (col 5, lines 27-30). Since the originating address generates the reply address, the reply address is predefined when the message is originated. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to substitute the predefined addresses of Kuspch in the system executing the of Tarnanen that assigns a unique reply address from a multiplicity of addresses, since the elements and their functions were known in the art, albeit in separate references.